

MINUTES

SALINA CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
CITY COMMISSION ROOM
Tuesday, July 17, 2007

MEMBERS

PRESENT: Appleby, Funk, Mikesell, Ritter, Schneider, Simpson, Soderberg and Yarnevich

MEMBERS

ABSENT: Bonilla-Baker

STAFF

PRESENT: Andrew, Asche and Burger

Chairman Simpson called the regular meeting to order at 4:30 following the conclusion of the 2:30 Study Session.

Item #1. Approval of the minutes of the regular meeting held on July 3, 2007.

The minutes of the July 3, 2007 meeting were approved as presented.

Item #2. Application #Z07-8, filed by the Salina City Planning Commission, requesting a comprehensive amendment of Article VI, District Regulations, Divisions 18, 19 and 20 relating to permitted and conditional uses and development limitations in the I-1 (Industrial Park), I-2 (Light Industrial) and I-3 (Heavy Industrial) districts. Continued from the June 19, 2007 meeting.

Mr. Andrew presented the staff report which is contained in the case file.

Mr. Schneider stated Dean I had a question about Section #6, about the fence, your point there is I assume is to not have visibility of what is stored behind the fence from the road. The only thing that it doesn't take into account for me is the terrain that might be behind that. What if they're located on the hill and they put an 8 ft. fence at the bottom of the hill and stack them up the hill?

Mr. Andrew stated certainly the North Ohio Overpass comes to mind. You can build an 8 ft. or 10 ft. fence and if you're up on the overpass and there is a salvage yard next to it or nearby that screening fence is not going to really have an impact. The idea there was, and it took awhile to get some scales set up, but the operators out on West State Street were for a period of time, were off-loading vehicles and portions of vehicles and kind of setting them out there by State Street outside their yard and leaving them for extended periods and not moving them in. It kind of defeats the purpose of having the fence enclosure and all if you can leave the vehicles out by the public street or highway. So the idea behind Section #6 there is to make it clear that if you have inoperable vehicles or salvage material you can't deposit it in the area outside the fence and waiting some length of time to move it in. We understand that there will be unloading and loading in temporary situations but there shouldn't be a need to have an inoperable vehicle or a part of a vehicle sitting out there for a month.

Mr. Schneider stated I might have been thinking of #5, is that the 8 ft. fence and the stacking, actually it looks like it was #4.

Mrs. Soderberg stated one of the things that we may also want to consider is our gateways. There is a provision in here #3 that no operations shall be

located within 500 ft. of any established residential district. What about limitations on major thoroughfares of the city? Was there any suggestion about restrictions along major entryways?

Mr. Andrew stated there are two ways to deal with that. One would be, I have seen it, where communities have actually gone in and listed segments of identified streets. The other way to do that is we have gateways or overlay districts, like we have a South 9th Corridor Overlay district, we have a North Ohio Overlay district and those kind of deal with the salvage yard question themselves. That would be the other alternative that would be to identify or list entryways into the community. If you just ruled out all arterial-type streets then you're really eliminating a lot of feasible sites. The one on State Street comes to mind, although that one is grandfathered in. There is actually one on East Pacific that's pretty well hidden. A lot of people don't know it's there. But it's very thickly screened by evergreen trees. But that would be the approach of identifying entryways into the city, whether it's West Crawford or North 9th or North Ohio. Some of that is taken care of by the fact that on Crawford and 9th we don't have any industrial zoning. On Ohio Street we have quite a bit of industrial zoning as we do on West State Street. So that would be the other way of doing that. But if you said that you couldn't be within so many feet of an arterial street then you'd be forcing them to locate on side streets or back streets where access may not be so good. The approach that was taken at least when we looked at North Ohio is to say that this is an important entryway corridor and salvage yards really shouldn't be allowed period in that corridor.

Mrs. Soderberg asked so the overlay district exists on North Ohio?

Mr. Andrew stated yes and on South 9th. There is no West Crawford overlay. There are so many different things that are going to coalesce here. We have the Wayfinding Program that is going to have Wayfinding signs and some aesthetic enhancements. West Crawford and North 9th were identified as major Wayfinding paths into the downtown area. You also have the Cultural Plan that is being discussed. They are also discussing entryways and gateways into the community. Then you are going to have the Comprehensive Plan that is going to do that. One option would be to put this in place like this and perhaps when all of those things come together and we actually identify as a community what we consider our main gateways and entryways, then this could be amended to say not within so many feet of any designated gateway or entryway into a community. That would be an option also.

Mr. Simpson asked any other comments or questions of Dean? I like the idea though of the Conditional Use Permit. That's just another opportunity to look at specific applications and deal with those.

Mr. Andrew stated there was a weakness from the standpoint that the only place that it was mentioned anywhere really was the I-3 district and it was listed as a permitted use and we didn't really have any stipulations to go with that permitted use. So the conditional use process has been used as a filter for other types of uses, whether it's downtown drinking establishments or other things, it's just a filter to put the proposed use and location through to see what conditions may be appropriate.

Mrs. Soderberg asked what was staff's reason for actually adding it then to I-2?

Mr. Andrew stated recognition of the fact that the I-2 zoning is much more prevalent than I-3 and several of the existing locations that we have are zoned I-2. But to me the fact that it's a conditional use helps establish that filter.

Mrs. Soderberg asked the other question I had was, under the I-2 district generally, not salvage yards or that kind of thing, what is the fencing requirements for I-2?

Mr. Andrew stated the language that is in the I-2 district regulations is on what is labeled as page 9 in your packet under Use Limitations. The language there is pretty long standing but I would say that it is probably the most confusing or poorly written section of our entire Zoning Ordinance. It basically means that if you are in an I-2 district and you are a predominately I-2 district with I-2 uses around you there are really no screening or outdoor storage limitations. But if you have I-2 that is next to a commercial or residential zone then you can only store things outside a building in a side or rear yard and you have to screen outdoor storage from those abutting uses and from the public street. But if you're in an industrial zoning area with industrial uses all around you then basically there is no screening requirement. What we would be looking for today is if you think the approach of requiring approval of a Conditional Use Permit for a salvage yard and the provisions that we are recommending would be the direction to go then a motion to recommend that as a text amendment with any additions or modifications that you think are appropriate would be the appropriate action for today.

Mr. Simpson asked any questions from the Commission?

Mrs. Soderberg stated I don't have any problem adopting it today I just hope we're real intentional with all of these plans going on now and with the Comprehensive Plan coming up, I hope we're intentional with entryways with what our vision and community vision is and then being willing to come back and look at this type of thing and signage and other things.

Mr. Andrew stated one of the aspects of, and we are getting closer to finalizing all the aspects of that, but one of the aspects of the proposed Comprehensive Plan process will be a visual assessment of the community. I think one of the things that will be assigned to Planning Commissioners or to the Advisory Committee is they will be given cameras to go out and take pictures of different portions of the community and bring those back and discuss and compare notes about what they saw and what their impressions were. One of the elements of the plan will be a visual assessment of the community and that would be an important discussion point.

Mrs. Soderberg asked so what do we need a motion to do?

Mr. Simpson stated a motion to recommend the text amendment.

Mr. Andrew stated if you want to recommend to the City Commission that these text amendments be adopted then this would go on to the City Commission for an ordinance change. Right now we have in place a moratorium that says nobody can come in and even propose a location for an expanded or new junkyard or salvage yard. What this would do it would allow us to lift that moratorium and would say these are the ground rules and the review process that would be in place if Salina Iron and Metal wanted to expand their operations. On West State Street we had a proposal to expand operations. This would then be in place and we could say now if you want to submit a proposal this is the way it would be reviewed. So in order for this to go forward to the City Commission in the form of an ordinance amendment we would need a recommendation today to adopt this as a text amendment.

MOTION: Mr. Funk stated I so move that we adopt the text amendment for Application #Z07-8 as proposed.

SECOND: Mrs. Yarnevich.

Mr. Simpson stated it has been moved and seconded that we adopt the text amendment proposed in Application #Z07-8. Any further questions or comments? Seeing none we are ready for a vote. Those in favor say "aye", opposed same sign.

VOTE: Motion carried 8-0.

Mrs. Soderberg stated just one other question related to this. Does the County I assume also have something in place that regulates salvage yards and that kind of thing?

Mr. Andrew stated they do to a degree. I haven't looked at those real in depth. What generally is the case is that the State of Kansas has requirements in place if the salvage yard is within so many feet of a state or federal highway then they have a set of guidelines as well. But they will not approve a state salvage yard license without sign off from the local zoning authorities. There was actually a proposal to do a large expansion of a salvage yard on West State Street and that is what kind of prompted all of this discussion and the State won't issue a license until we're ready locally. Or if we're never ready locally they won't issue it.

Item #3. Background Report – Regulation of Signs and Billboards.

Mr. Andrew presented the staff report which is contained in the case file.

Mrs. Soderberg asked what would be the process if an existing or new business came into your office and wanted to convert? What would happen right now without a moratorium at this point?

Mr. Andrew stated I'm not sure how we would respond. I think we kind of have taken these in stages. There was once a proposal, I don't recall that it was a billboard, but it was a sign that was kind of like a set of curtains that would flip between messages and our initial response was that it was a moving sign and our ordinance doesn't allow moving signs so that's not permitted. I'm not sure that's the best or most clear answer. I think there's going to be more movement in that direction and so there's really two issues here. One is the issue of billboards in general, where, how close together, how big, are there corridors that we want to be more restrictive in. The other one deals with just the technological trends of the digital display type signs and having some handle on that. I could see something maybe moving forward on that and leaving the question of the wheres, how bigs and separations on billboards for a more general community discussion. We at least wanted to study the issue and do some research and bring what we found to your attention. This is not necessarily an action item for today. This is just our effort at getting current on what's happening with the whole digital display and electronic billboard trend.

Mr. Mikesell stated there is a lot of issues that I think Sydney and I are on the same page somewhat. We think the corridors to the city should be protected and have every chance to show off the good things of the city. Sometimes the big billboard, whether that be digital or not digital, maybe isn't the best approach to that. But there is another factor in here that is going to happen with billboards. Right now a standard billboard, which is 12 ft. x 24 ft., requires that someone go up there and physically change a printed cover. There are safety issues involved with those things. With a digital billboard it gives you the ability to change that message quite easily and often. We are strictly talking about off-premises signs in this section, is that correct?

Mr. Andrew stated we're just talking about signs that advertise something that is not available at the location where the sign is. Not business signs but advertising signs or billboards that are advertising something that is in a remote location.

Mr. Mikesell stated I guess personally I don't have a problem with the 8 second time limit on there. And certainly their goal is to look at a certain number of cars that they're going to get a message to over a certain period of time. The animation aspect of it is one of the benefits of having a digital sign. Certainly your cell phone is animated any more and all of the games that the kids plays on the videos are all animated. I think the animation thing that if the community or the Board decides should be something that should be left out is something that they're going to have to deal with again in the future. Because I think the animation portion of it is just a fact of life. I think that the issue of the billboards being easy to change, in the long run it's going to be quite a bit more financially feasible for the billboard producers, it's going to make that portion to where you're going to be seeing a lot more applications for those conversions.

Mr. Andrew stated I think the one that was the subject of the moratorium and the big discussions in the city of Des Moines, the sign company had sold six spots on that billboard and they were sold or leased in 8 second increments. They said that was the industry standard, that the image remain in place for 8 seconds and then transition to the next advertiser. I don't know if there is any limit as to how many different ones you can put on a particular billboard.

Mr. Mikesell stated the software wouldn't limit you to that. You could roll those over as many times as you want.

Mrs. Soderberg asked is there any consideration for sunsetting billboards that are in town, I'm thinking of the one across from Braum's there, there is also one on Ash or Elm?

Mr. Andrew stated there are some communities that have provisions for what they call amortization, where there is an off-premise sign, and it is non-conforming, that is it wouldn't be able to be there today, and you basically have an amortization schedule that says this can be here for ten years and then you have to remove it and there may be a value assigned at that time and that value is given to the sign company or whoever is receiving the revenue from that and the sign has to be removed at that time. The only thing we have in place now deals with abandonment of signs. If you have a business that closes the sign can remain there for six months and then needs to be physically removed. But that would apply to an on-site sign that is advertising a business that is no longer there. Some of our billboards would not be permitted where they are today even under our current standards. But we don't really have a provision to get rid of them unless they were abandoned. I think there is one over on North Street and Broadway where all that is left is some post supports and I think a frame. But it hasn't had a message or anything on it for years. That's considered to be abandoned and it has lost its grandfather status so you couldn't put one back there. As long as it continues to be used it's grandfathered in. But yes, there are provisions that communities have for amortizing out billboards over time.

Mrs. Soderberg stated I would be interested in looking at those. If you think they would convert those billboards to the digital, I don't think that's what we want to see.

Mr. Mikesell stated the other thing I don't see addressed here is, and you don't see it so much around here, but in metro Kansas City and Grand Island come to mind, most of the new billboards you see going up are double-decker and their contention is it costs them about half as much to do that second one on top of there. For my personal feeling, if you are going to have a billboard, one is plenty. Those things that are double-deckered are not attractive to me.

Mr. Andrew stated that could be addressed, for instance in A-1 we have a maximum of 400 sq. ft, there could be a provision for a maximum height of billboard and if you had the height set at the right level like 25 ft. or 30 ft. then you wouldn't have the ability to have the double-decker.

Mr. Mikesell asked do we have a distance between billboards?

Mr. Andrew stated not in any of the other districts except for the A-1 where it just says that you can't have a billboard within 500 ft. of another billboard.

Mr. Mikesell stated I believe the state is 300 ft. on highway.

Mr. Andrew stated that is the other interesting aspect of this that we're learning about. Maybe you know more about this. The State of Kansas has turned regulation into a revenue source where you have to get a permit or license to put a billboard out on a federal highway or interstate and have that approved by KDOT and you have to renew that every year and there is a fee involved. I can't recall exactly what that fee is. The difference being in the City of Salina and you put up a sign you pay a sign permit fee and that's it for the life of the sign except for what you might have in the way of a lease from the landowner. KDOT, even though it's not on KDOT's property, they are charging an annual fee to maintain billboards. It's partially driven by a desire to generate revenue.

Mr. Mikesell stated they have an application fee which is assessed whether the permit is approved or not. So we're going to get something out of the deal no matter what.

Mr. Andrew stated but again, this report is there for informational purposes and to get things like the comment from Mr. Mikesell addressing the double-decker signs. But we figure that at least we have done the research, looked at different aspects and we feel like we're ready to respond. But as Commissioner Soderberg said, the whole subject of sign codes and billboards and all is something that could be left to let the community to decide when it discusses the Comprehensive Plan and the vision for the next 10-20 years. Again, this is not an action item, it is just there for your information. The other things that we put in there were just again in there for information purposes, a summary about banners, balloons, temporary signs, those types of things just to give you a background of how that's dealt with. And just for your benefit if you want to have a personal opinion or political sign in your front yard, as long as it's 8 sq. ft. or less you can have it there year round to express your opinion on something. That is all there for informational purposes on how those smaller type signs, like temporary signs, balloons and political signs are addressed. So again, this is more for your information then specific action.

Mr. Simpson stated thank you Dean.

Item #4. Review of 2007-2008 CIP.

Mr. Andrew presented the staff report with visual graphics which is contained in the case file.

Mrs. Soderberg stated what occurs to me, because it was another item in our packet, was the annexation items. Looking at the road improvements and street widening and all of that, does that line up well with the annexations that occurred and the ones that we're foreseeing in the future?

Mr. Andrew stated those two items do tie together and they were kind of intended to tie together and if you could go to the map there John of the future annexations that would help. One of the reasons that we brought this to you is clearly one of the things that is maybe not well understood is that

the Planning Commission's policy, since around 1990, has been that if we don't have annexation of the property on both sides of a major roadway then we leave the roadway in the county if it's not currently built to city standards. I think a lot of people don't realize that out here on South 9th Street in front of Long-McArthur Ford and all of those places that 9th Street is a county roadway. At this point in time we have portions of South Ohio around Schilling Road and those are county road sections. When the city has only one side of the street we have not annexed the street itself. What we've tried to show here, and it does tie back to the Capital Improvements Program, these areas in yellow here are not currently within the city limits and then the other part of this is in that report we tried to give you an idea of what the limits of our annexation authority are. At least since I have worked for the City of Salina we have never forcibly annexed a piece of property where the landowner was not seeking services or interested in annexing the property. The only exceptions to that would be things the City owns like the Sewage Treatment Plant. This out here is the old Animal Shelter that was owned by the City, so that's why that's inside the city limits. Then the other exception is roadways where the City owns and controls the right-of-way. These are areas in the vicinity of the North Ohio Overpass that are outside of the city limits. We've annexed some property on West Grand but there is some that is outside the city limits. This area here is completely surrounded by the city but has not been annexed again because the City doesn't generally initiate that. These areas here, we've got annexation of the Airport and a portion here, but this area has been left out. This is Crestwood Cabinets here where a lot of the surrounding area is inside of the city limits. The east side of South 9th Street, east side of South Ohio, this is a property owned by the school district that was purchased with the idea of being a future elementary school site that has not been annexed. This is the East Salina Master Plan area. So it certainly doesn't make sense probably to make investments in South 9th Street unless the roadway is entirely in the city. There certainly is something to think about before investing that kind of money in a roadway and then not have any jurisdiction over the area that is on one side of it. That is not a real desirable situation either. In the case of South Ohio we have to get ownership of all that road right-of-way first before we could annex that. But certainly if we want to widen that road we would want to take that into consideration. But the main purpose for the Planning Commission reviewing the Capital Improvement Program is to say is the City proposing investments that are way out on a limb and inconsistent with what you understand is the direction the City is trying to grow? The other aspect is just to give you a forum or an opportunity to communicate to the City Commission about any particular projects that you as a Commission see as important for the future of the community. So in terms of the CIP, the appropriate action there would be just a motion to endorse the 2007-2008 CIP and the projects listed unless there are any particular exceptions that you think are questionable in terms of the city's Comprehensive Plan and then as a follow-up to that if there are any items that are not on the list. For instance, for the East Magnolia widening there has not been a source of funds identified and it has not really been scheduled as an improvement for that reason. But if there are projects like that that you think are important this would be an opportunity to communicate that also.

Mrs. Soderberg stated that's the one I was going to bring up because the development, the soccer fields, the home construction, that road has changed immensely in the last 3-5 years. I think we're not being prudent if we don't work harder at identifying funding for that project.

Mr. Ritter stated it seems like that 5.5 million dollars is a lot of money for 9th Street when most of the stuff now is on the east side.

Mr. Andrew stated the idea was, like I said on South 9th, that you would take it through and that completion of the project would be from Belmont all the way to Water Well. But when you program South 9th in you are pushing back

in terms of years when you could do East Magnolia. So that is no doubt the case. The last attempt to secure KDOT funding, which was received for the South Ohio project, was not successful for East Magnolia. So that's why that's been pushed out. If there is no KDOT cost sharing then that becomes a strictly locally financed project. That would be an example or if there are other projects that you think should be on the front burner or should be a particular priority this would be your opportunity also.

Mrs. Yarnevich asked is there a chance of getting KDOT funding for that in the future or have they just said they're hands off?

Mr. Andrew stated it tends to be rather cyclical and I don't know all the criteria but when they looked at it the South Ohio project scored higher with KDOT in terms of that. My experience has been that KDOT doesn't generally do those in back to back years. If you look at the different projects around Salina they have generally been spaced out about three years apart in terms of KDOT funding. They spread the money amongst the various communities.

Mr. Funk stated I'm in agreement on this East Magnolia. It seems to me that that should have a higher priority than South 9th in terms of development and traffic problems and things of that nature. How far would that East Magnolia project go?

Mr. Andrew stated I think initially from Ohio over to the bridge because if you're looking at a widening of the roadway then the bridge becomes a whole other project in and of itself. So it may be from Ohio over to say the entrance to the Soccer Complex.

Mr. Funk asked where is the city limit there?

Mr. Andrew stated the city limit is basically the whole south side. This is the location where actually both of these properties here are outside the city limits and the Soccer Complex and Highland Meadows Hamlet are inside the city limits. But basically from the east edge of River Trail over the roadway itself is outside of the city limits. That is another case where unless the City has annexed both sides of the roadway they leave the roadway in the county. So the portion that is in the city will be the area from Ohio over to what is the east edge of the River Trail Subdivision. That's where you come into the city limits on Magnolia. Realizing that the Soccer Complex and Highland Meadows Hamlet are inside the city limits but Magnolia Road is not in the city at that location.

Mrs. Soderberg stated I didn't see anything on North 9th. I thought there was a plan to upgrade those medians?

Mr. Andrew stated in the 2008 projects, Item #59 Wayfinding, there are two aspects to that project. One is the actual Wayfinding signage or the signage plan and the directional signage. The other aspect of that is median improvements on North 9th Street which would consist mostly of landscaping enhancements.

Mr. Simpson asked would the Commission like to recommend the approval of the projects with the addition of Magnolia Road?

Mrs. Soderberg stated I just would like to notate maybe that the Planning Commission is concerned that that's not funded anywhere in the future.

Mr. Simpson stated that's a valid concern.

Mrs. Soderberg stated I also think the problem with the whole idea of the county and the city boundaries and doing improvements I think we just have

to get a handle on that, that the city isn't making improvements to roads that they don't have any control over.

Mr. Simpson stated particularly South 9th Street based on very recent history. It sounds like if it's going to be done the City is going to have to do it which entails annexation.

Mrs. Soderberg stated and South Ohio.

Mr. Andrew stated it entails annexation if you're going to make that investment.

Mr. Simpson asked do I have a motion accept the Capital Improvement Program and schedule?

MOTION: Mrs. Yarnevich stated I move that we endorse the Capital Improvement Program project list and schedule.

SECOND: Mrs. Soderberg.

Mr. Simpson stated it has been moved and seconded that we accept the Capital Improvement Program schedule. Any further questions or comments? Seeing none we are ready for a vote. All those in favor say "aye", opposed same sign.

VOTE: Motion carried 8-0.

Item #5. Consider adoption of an Annexation Plan.

Mr. Andrew presented the staff report with visual graphics which is contained in the case file.

Mrs. Soderberg asked and the Planning Commission can not initiate that but can only suggest to the City Commission?

Mr. Andrew stated you can only suggest areas that should be targeted for annexation. There was some discussion on South 9th Street particularly the east side. We went from proposals for leaving it in the county but giving the City extraterritorial jurisdiction over it, to the County agreeing to adopt the same standards for that area that the City had, to then discussions of having it annexed into the city if the roadway was improved. That's been an area of frequent discussion and it's always an awkward situation when you have city on one side and county on the other side of a major roadway like that. If you're not comfortable with that approach, the alternative would be to say that you think the City should be more proactive in going out and annexing properties ahead of time. That is something that can be noted by staff and the City Commission. But this is mainly to show you the areas that have been identified as potential candidates. Some of them, like #7, the City could annex that today if they wanted to. But the approach has been that the City doesn't force annexation unless it can provide services and right now it can not provide all the needed services to that area.

Mrs. Soderberg asked could we at least note Dean that when we have our community meetings that this be a topic. It would be far easier for the City Commission to talk about this if they understood that the public understood the issue before engaging in a long process.

Mr. Andrew stated annexation is a pretty complicated topic and we haven't had many annexation controversies around here just because the City is not that aggressive.

Mrs. Soderberg stated but the soccer field came really close. I'm just saying if the public understands that we're spending money on this roadway but we don't have control over that part of it then I think the public would be willing to say to the City Commission that this doesn't make sense to us. But we at least have to talk to them about it.

Mr. Simpson asked isn't that east side in the South 9th Overlay district?

Mr. Andrew stated it is. What the discussion was first was that you would have the overlay district and the county would grant the City authority to review development proposals on the east side of 9th Street and then they took the approach that it could stay in the county and we will have the County staff and Commissions apply the same standards to development on that side. It hasn't quite worked out that way. The numbers on the map just represent north and south. We actually have a strip of land here that we discovered that was abandoned railroad right-of-way where this is part of the city and this is part of the city and there is a strip there that needs to be brought into the city to clean that up. This again is just more for informational purposes and again to kind of give you an overview of what the City can and cannot do in the way of annexation. It's not an action item other than if there are annexation issues that are important, which I'm hearing that roadways and what happens next to roadways is, then we'll try to take that into account.

Mr. Funk asked are there City services like water and sewer to all of those businesses east of 9th Street there and north of Water Well Road?

Mr. Andrew stated for the most part. Certainly a lot of that South Industrial Area couldn't function there without City water and sewer and there is actually a fire protection district where they have a contract with the City of Salina for fire protection. But what happens is if you are outside of the city limits then you're not paying city property tax but you're paying 125% of what city residents pay for water and a 125% of what they pay for sewer and you have to pay either through a contract or other means for fire protection. But yes a lot of what is on the east side of 9th Street has access to city services. It's just historically it was developed in the county and has remained that way.

Mr. Funk asked you stated something like 300 ft., how far would 300 ft. take you on that aerial photograph over there, do you have any idea?

Mr. Andrew walked to the screen. It kind of lines up between these lots here all the way down to Advance Auto Parts so that's kind of an arbitrary number but you wouldn't want to divide up the property. For the vacant property here and for this property that is already in the city the 300 ft. number would probably have to be adjusted based on how deep the property ownership was. There would be portions of that where the County Commission may have to consent to that to make that happen.

Mr. Funk stated I guess I find that a little strange that all that property is not within the city limits when they have full services.

Mr. Andrew stated it's a historical fact that the city grew out to that area but it used to be quite remote from the city when a lot of that industry developed in the early 1970's.

Mrs. Yarnevich asked why wouldn't you annex the whole tract? Why would you just annex 300 ft.?

Mr. Andrew stated you would probably come in and look at each of these individually.

Mrs. Yarnevich asked isn't there a division like a mile by a mile?

Mr. Andrew stated the alternative is again to annex the entire area. The other thing is for each of those businesses all of their budgets are set up as not being inside the city limits for mill-levy purposes and other things. So you would have to literally do an analysis for each of those like Exide and some of the other businesses as to what the financial impact would be of annexation versus not annexing. Some of that has been done and was discussed when we did the South 9th Corridor study but if all those improvements are made to South 9th Street it's going to raise the question again of what happens on the east side of South 9th. A lot of these items here are just for informational purposes and food for thought and to provide you background as we get ready for the Comprehensive Plan.

Item #6. Other matters.

Mr. Andrew stated we will have a meeting on August 7th. Right now we have plats filed for the remainder of Magnolia Hills Estates which is platting the property on over to Holmes Road and for the remainder of Quail Meadows which is the frontage along Ohio Street north of Schilling Road. Then there is a piece of property that is called Timberline on West Republic and that is an existing plat but no development has occurred there and there is a change in that for the Commission to consider. We'll switch gears and actually have all development applications at your next meeting.

Mr. Simpson stated very good. Anybody have anything else?

Mr. Andrew stated the only other item is that some of you are eligible for reappointment in August and if you are interested and you have continued eligibility you need to get from the Clerk's office an Expression of Interest form and the deadline for being considered for reappointment, is July 30th to get that in to the Clerk's office. Some people's terms are expiring, some are not on the 2007 cycle, but if you are eligible for reappointment, I think my note here is that Mr. Mikesell is eligible and he has turned his form in. So that applies to Arts and Humanities, Planning Commission and all across the board the deadline for Expression of Interest forms is the end of July. That is all the business we have for you.

Mrs. Soderberg asked is there anybody else Dean?

Mr. Andrew stated I don't think Mr. Simpson is eligible for another term. Les, you were filling in for somebody else's term but you should be eligible for reappointment. Les, Jerry and Patrick were the only ones I saw whose terms were going to expire at the end of August.

Mr. Simpson stated seeing no other matters we are adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 5:59 p.m.


Dean Andrew, Secretary

ATTEST: _____